

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                            | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/529,020                                 | 10/06/2005     | Yan Gao              | NRC-6               | 8814             |
| Ira S Dorman                               | 7590 08/26/200 | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| Suite 300                                  |                | DOLLINGER, MICHAEL M |                     |                  |
| 330 Roberts Street East Hartford, CT 06108 |                |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ,  |                | 1796                 |                     |                  |
|  |                |                      |                     |                  |
|  |                |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |                |                      | 08/26/2009          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## **Advisory Action** Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |  |
|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| 10/529,020      | GAO ET AL.   |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |  |
| MIKE DOLLINGER  | 1796         |  |  |

|   | MIKE DOLLINGER   | 1796   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence add   | ress                                     |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF   | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR   | ALLOWANCE.   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>N The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on<br/>application, applicant must timely file one of the following<br/>application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe<br/>for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C<br/>periods:</li> </ol>  | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit<br>al (with appeal fee) in compliance            | t, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or           | hich places the<br>(3) a Request         |  |  |
| <ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ul>  | of the final rejection.  |  |  |  |  |
| ) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I<br>MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f  |  | FIRST REPLY WAS FI   | LED WITHIN TWO                           |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date<br>have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhunder 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s<br>set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later<br>may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b).<br>NOTICE OF APPEAL. | ension and the corresponding amount of<br>hortened statutory period for reply origin | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br/>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>   | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                     |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> </ol>   |  |  | cause                                    |  |  |
| <ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> </ul>   |  | ducing or simplifying t                                    | ne issues for                            |  |  |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c  |  | ected claims.  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  |  | mpliant Amendment (I                                       | PTOL-324).                               |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled</li> </ol>   |  | imely filed amendmer                                       | nt canceling the                         |  |  |
| non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  | be entered and an e  | xplanation of                            |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Image: The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  | before or on the date of filing a No<br>sufficient reasons why the affidavi          | otice of Appeal will <u>not</u><br>t or other evidence is  | be entered<br>necessary and              |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>   | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea<br>and was not earlier presented. Se       | and/or appellant fail<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1              | s to provide a<br>).                     |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br/>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>  | n of the status of the claims after er   | ntry is below or attach                                    | ed.                                      |  |  |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but   | does NOT place the application in  | condition for allowan                                      | ce because:                              |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ( 13. Other:   | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).  |  |  |  |  |

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Randy Gulakowski/

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants have amended the claims to limit the poly(phthalazinones) to consist sesentially of unit of the formula I. Applicants is oa regue that since the SPPESK polymers of Dai et al are water soluble they cannot function amentranes in a PEM. However this raises new considerations of the prior at and of the instant application: Applicants claim a degree of sulfonation of up to 1.2 (in claim 15) but indicate in Table 5 of the disclosure that a poly(phthalazinone according to the amended claims with a degree of sulfonation of 1.2 is water soluble at 80 C. In summary Applicants argue that the prior art polymers are inoperable in the intended user of sulfonations of the claimed invention because they are water soluble but endodiments of the claimed invention are also water soluble). Furthermore, Applicants test water solubility at 80 C but the arguments indicate that 90 C is a reasonable PEM-fuel operating temperature [see Applicants arguments submitted 0306/09 pag 7 line 2]. It is unclear whether the claimed only will be water soluble at the operating temperature of 90 C. The proposed amendments henceforth raise more issues that would require further consideration and do not blace the research claims in condition for allowance.